DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 031 143 HE 001 010

By-Stordahl, K. E.

Influences on College Choice.

Northern Michigan Univ., Marquette. Institutional Research Office.
Pub Date Apr 68
Note-22p.
EDRS Price MF-$0.25 HC-$1.20
Descriptors-*Academic Performance, *College Choice, Comparative Analysis, *Decision Making, *Higher Education, Socioeconomic Influences, *Student Characteristics
Identifiers-*Northern Michigan University

Reasons given by students for their selection of Northern Michigan University and the relationship between these reasons and selected demographic and academic characteristics were the major concerns of this study. Data about 1966 freshmen were obtained from university records, and from an 18-item questionnaire on college choice with high loadings on 4 factors of influence: intellectual emphasis, practicality, advice of others, and social emphasis. Analysis of variance was used to discover differences in scores on each 3-point influence scale between 8 groups of 55 students each: Upper and Lower Michigan residents, males and females, and those who graduated in upper and lower halves of their high school classes. Most of the differences found among the groups were small. The more academically able students --particularly females-- from lower socioeconomic groups in Upper Michigan emphasized practical matters such as cost and distance, but not students from upper socioeconomic families in Lower Michigan who were lower achievers yet had expected to go to college. Practicality seemed to be correlated with first semester academic performance, since students in the Lower Michigan group who were most influenced by this factor tended to achieve more academically than others who were not. Social factors were only slightly more important to Lower Michigan students. Both groups stressed intellectual factors but not the advice of others, and females emphasized intellectual considerations more than males. (WM)

ED031143

INFLUENCES ON COLLEGE CHOICE

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

by

K. E. Stordahl

Office of Institutional Research
Northern Michigan University
Marquette, Michigan 49855

April, 1968

HE 001 010

TABLE OF CONTENTS

List of Tables ii

Summary 1

Introduction 3

Results

Intellectual Emphasis 4

Practicality 7

Advice of Others 9

Social Emphasis 9

Bibliography 11

Appendix 12

LIST OF TABLES

			Page
Table	1.	Mean Scores On Each Scale (N = 55 for all means)	5
Table	2.	Coefficients of Correlation Between College Influence Scale Scores and First Semester College Grade Point Average (N = 180 for all coefficients)	5
Table	3.	Analysis of Variance of Intellectual Emphasis Scale Scores .	6
Table	4.	Analysis of Variance of Practicality Scale Scores	6
Table	5.	Analysis of Variance of Advice of Others Scale Scores . . .	6
Table	6.	Analysis of Variance of Social Emphasis Scale Scores . . .	6
Table	7.	Item Mean Scores (N = 55 for all means)	14
		Analysis of Variance of Scores On Items	
Table	8.	"Good Faculty"	15
Table	9.	"High Scholastic Standards"	15
Table	10.	"Has Special Curriculum I wanted"	15
Table	11.	"Desirable Intellectual Atmosphere"	15
Table	12.	"Desirable Location"	16
Table	13.	"Low Cost"	16
Table	14.	"Close to Home	16
Table	15.	"Advice of Parents"	16
Table	16.	"Advice of Brother or Sister"	17
Table	17.	"Advice of Alumni Contacts"	17
Table	18.	"Advice of High School Teacher (s)"	17
Table	19.	"Advice of High School or College Counselor"	17
Table	20.	"Talk with Admissions Counselor from Northern" . . .	18
Table	21.	"Desirable Social Climate and Activities Program" . .	18
Table	22.	"Good Athletic Program"	18
Table	23.	"My Friends are Going to Northern"	18
Table	24.	"Has Fraternities and Sororities"	19
Table	25.	"Coeducational"	19

SUMMARY

The decision of a young adult to enroll in a particular college or university is no doubt influenced by a complex set of forces including his own goals, abilities, and personality as well as parental values, socioeconomic status and other environmental factors. This study was concerned with a very limited aspect of the general question of influences on college choice; namely, how do Northern Michigan University freshmen explain their choice of a college, and what is the relationship of their explanations to selected demographic and academic characteristics. The data were obtained from a questionnaire on college choice administered as a part of the 1966 freshman orientation testing program and from University records. The questionnaire consisted of 18 items concerned with factors which may have influenced a student to enroll at Northern Michigan University. Students rated each item on a three-point scale as to the extent to which the factor influenced him to enroll at Northern. Four influence scores, each based on three to six items, were derived from the questionnaire. These were designated as Intellectual Emphasis, Practicality, Advice of Others, and Social Emphasis.

Analysis of variance was used to test whether or not the scores on each scale differed among the following groups: Upper Michigan and Lower Michigan students, men and women, and students who had graduated in the upper half of their high school class versus those who had graduated in the lower half. Correlation coefficients were also computed between scores on each scale and first semester college GPA for four student groups; namely, Upper Michigan men, Lower Michigan men, Upper Michigan women, and Lower Michigan women. The analysis of variance was based upon a randomly selected sample of 55 students within each of the eight student groups, and the correlation analysis upon randomly selected samples of 180 students in each group.

Students from Upper Michigan said that their decision to attend Northern was very strongly influenced by practical considerations of cost and distance. They also gave substantial relative weight to the factor designated as Intellectual Emphasis; that is, they felt they were quite strongly influenced by their perception of the quality of the faculty and program available to them. They said that they were less influenced by the advice of other persons and social considerations than by either practical or intellectual influences.

Lower Michigan students, like those from Upper Michigan, gave substantial emphasis to intellectual matters as an influence upon their decision to come to Northern. As would be expected, however, they gave substantially less emphasis to practical considerations of cost and distance than Upper Michigan students. Lower Michigan students felt, as did those from Upper Michigan, that the advice of others, including parents, teachers, counselors, and friends, in comparison with other factors, had had relatively little influence on their decision to attend Northern. Social factors seemed to be slightly, but not significantly, more important to Lower than Upper Michigan students.

Students who had graduated in the upper half of their high school class said that they had been more influenced by intellectual considerations than did those who had graduated in the lower half. Similarly women tended to give more emphasis to intellectual matters than did men. The only other factor on which there was a significant difference between either sexes or high school rank groups was Practicality -- women who had graduated in the upper half of their class had significantly higher scores on this variable than those who graduated in the lower half.

To ascertain whether the greater concern for practical matters expressed by women who had graduated in the upper half of their high school class reflected the socioeconomic status of their families, the occupations of their fathers were compared with those of women who had graduated in the lower half of their high school class. A disproportionate number of women who had graduated in the lower half of their class were found to have come from upper socioeconomic groups; whereas, a disproportionate number of those who had graduated in the upper half of their class were found to have come from lower socioeconomic families. Thus, the higher practicality scores of the more academically able students seems to reflect a realistic concern about financing a college education.

A likely explanation of the negative relationship found between high school achievement and socioeconomic status of freshman women at Northern is the differential emphasis on, and opportunity for, higher education among upper and lower socioeconomic groups. That is, there is a tendency for only the more academically talented women from lower socioeconomic groups to go to college; whereas, among upper socioeconomic groups, college is often viewed as a normal consequence of high school graduation even for the less able student. This phenomenon in combination with Northern's open admissions policy seems to be a plausible explanation of the relationship found in this study.

The only college influence scale which was significantly correlated with first semester academic performance at Northern was Practicality. This correlation was very small and continued to be significant only for Lower Michigan students when the effect of academic ability as measured by the School and College Ability Test was controlled through partial correlation. Thus it appeared that Lower Michigan students most influenced by practical considerations, such as cost, in deciding to come to Northern may have been more highly motivated to achieve academically than those with less practical concerns.

Most of the differences found among the several groups of freshmen included in this study were quite small. Consequently, inferences made from them must be interpreted with considerable caution.

INTRODUCTION

How do students select a college? What are the motivational and environmental factors which influence their choice? Somewhat surprisingly, it appears that relatively little is known about how or why young adults choose the particular college which they elect to attend.

Holland (1958) in a study of National Merit Scholars asked a sample of high school seniors why they had selected the college in which they planned to enroll. Major reasons given by the sample of Merit Scholars included their perception of the academic quality of the college, practical consideration of distance from home and cost, and the recommendation of other persons. Similar influences have been reported by Douvan and Kaye (1962). In a more recent methodological study, Richards and Holland (1965) made a factor analysis of the responses of a national sample of students to a brief questionnaire on college choice administered as a part of the American College Testing Program. Four factors of influence were found: Intellectual Emphasis, Practicality, Advice of Others, and Social Emphasis.

The study reported here was concerned with a very limited aspect of the general problem of college choice; namely, how do freshmen at Northern explain their choice of a college. A second purpose was to ascertain whether the reasons they gave for their choice were related to selected demographic and academic characteristics.

Data were obtained from a questionnaire on college choice administered as a part of the 1966 freshman orientation testing program and from University records. The questionnaire was based on the Richards and Holland study (1965), and, in general, consisted of items with high loadings on the four factors found in that study. Minor modifications in the items were made to make them more specific to Northern, such as the substitution of the word "Northern" for the more general term "college," and one item was omitted from the Intellectual Emphasis factor as it seemed inappropriate for Northern students. A list of the items is included in the Appendix.

Each student rated each of the 18 items on a three-point scale: (1) had little or no influence on decision to come to Northern, (2) had some but relatively minor influence on decision to come to Northern, and (3) had a strong influence on decision to come to Northern. Item responses were given weights of one to three, and a score was obtained on each scale by summing the item weights.

A three-factor factorial analysis of variance was performed to ascertain whether student responses differed by sex, high school rank (graduated in upper half vs. lower half of class), and location of home (Upper Michigan vs. Lower Michigan, i. e. either above or below the Straits of Mackinac). Out-of-state students were excluded because of the relatively small number enrolled; also excluded were part-time students and students for whom complete data were not available. To obtain equal numbers in each subgroup for the analysis of variance, a random sample of 55 students was drawn from each subgroup; with eight subgroups the total sample consisted of 440 students. The analysis of variance was run for each scale and for each item within a scale. To aid in interpretion of the data, t tests were computed

between all pairs of cell means with the standard error of the difference calculated from the within cell variance. Because of the large number of t's which resulted from this computation, only selected values are included in this report. Subsequent to executing these analyses, the mean scores on all scales were transformed to a three-point scale by dividing each raw score mean by the number of items in the scale.

To ascertain whether any relationship existed between scores on the college influence scales and college academic performance, coefficients of correlation were computed between scale scores, total score on the School and College Ability Test (SCAT), and first semester GPA at Northern. In those instances where the coefficients of correlation between scale scores and college GPA were significantly greater than zero, the influence of general ability as measured by SCAT was partialed out by partial correlation. Correlation coefficients were calculated separately for men and women from Upper and Lower Michigan. All coefficients were based upon a randomly selected sample of 180 students from within each of the groups; thus, the total sample was composed of 720 students.

The relatively homogeneous samples of students used in the correlation analysis were also used to estimate the internal-consistency reliability of the college influence scales. Average item intercorrelations were obtained for each sample group using Fisher's z coefficients; the Spearman-Brown formula was then applied to estimate the reliability of the scale. The average reliability coefficients were .64, .44, .61 and .51 respectively for the Intellectual Emphasis, Practicality, Advice of Others, and Social Emphasis scales.

RESULTS

Intellectual Emphasis

The mean scores for each student group on each of the college influence scales are given in Table 1, and the analysis of variance of the scores in Tables 3 through 6. Similar data for each item of the scale may be found in the appendix. As can be seen from Tables 1 and 3, women tended to say that they had been more influenced by intellectual considerations in coming to Northern than did men, and students who had graduated in the upper half of their high school class seemed to think that they had been somewhat more influenced by intellectual concerns than those who graduated in the lower half of their class. In both instances this relationship was somewhat tenuous, however (significant at the .05 level), and as may be seen from Table 2, the correlation analysis did not show a significant relationship between Intellectual Emphasis score and college GPA. Thus, it appears that Intellectual Emphasis scores, although somewhat related to sex, had little relationship to academic performance.

Table 1. Mean Scores on Each Scale (N = 55 for All Means).

Scale	Men				Women			
	L. Mich.		U. Mich.		L. Mich.		U. Mich.	
	HSRU	HSRL	HSRU	HSRL	HSRU	HSRL	HSRU	HSRL
Intellectual Emphasis	1.75	1.66	1.83	1.67	1.96	1.77	1.79	1.85
Practicality	1.52	1.48	2.34	2.40	1.64	1.43	2.54	2.2(
Advice of Others	1.55	1.53	1.67	1.59	1.58	1.47	1.64	1.58
Social Emphasis	1.60	1.68	1.68	1.56	1.68	1.68	1.58	1.62

HSRU = Upper half of high school class; HSRL = Lower half

Table 2. Coefficients of Correlation Between College Influence Scale Scores and First Semester College Grade Point Average (N = 180 for all Coefficients)

Scale	Men		Women	
	L. Mich.	U. Mich.	L. Mich.	U. Mich.
Intellectual Emphasis	.032	.001	.107	.066
Practicality	.173*	.088	.262**	.161*
Advice of Others	.086	.012	.057	-.035
Social Emphasis	-.111	-.066	-.033	-.122

* Significant at .05 level
** Significant at .01 level

Table 3. Analysis of Variance of Intellectual Emphasis Scale Scores.

Source	d f	MS	F
Sex	1	23.64	6.53*
Home Location	1	0.00	0.00
HS Rank	1	16.03	4.43*
Sex x Location	1	4.00	1.11
Sex x HSR	1	1.53	.42
Location x HSR	1	2.94	.81
Sex x Location x HSR	1	11.13	3.07
Within	432	3.62	
Total	439		

* $P < .05$

Table 4. Analysis of Variance of Practicality Scale Scores.

Source	d f	MS	F
Sex	1	1.20	.60
Home Location	1	767.18	384.29**
HS Rank	1	14.91	7.47**
Sex x Location	1	.02	.01
Sex x HSR	1	16.42	8.23**
Location x HSR	1	.05	.03
Sex x Location x HSR	1	1.65	.83
Within	432	1.99	
Total	439		

** $P < .01$

Table 5. Analysis of Variance of Advice of Others Scale Scores.

Source	d f	MS	F
Sex	1	.90	.17
Home Location	1	29.53	5.64*
HS Rank	1	16.03	3.06
Sex x Location	1	.03	.01
Sex x HSR	1	1.53	.29
Location x HSR	1	.03	.01
Sex x Location x HSR	1	2.62	.50
Within	432	5.23	
Total	439		

* $P < .05$

Table 6. Analysis of Variance of Social Emphasis Scale Scores.

Source	d f	MS	F
Sex	1	.27	.07
Home Location	1	6.87	1.73
HS Rank	1	0.00	0.00
Sex x Location	1	2.78	.70
Sex x HSR	1	1.42	.36
Location x HSR	1	5.45	1.37
Sex x Location x HSR	1	10.20	2.57
Within	432	3.97	
Total	439		

Examination of the individual item means and analysis of them (Appendix, Tables 7 through 11) revealed that item mean differences were, in general, consistent with scale mean differences. On one item (Desirable Intellectual Atmosphere) a sex x HSR x home location interaction was present (significant at .05 level). Similar interaction was found on the Intellectual Emphasis scale ($.05 < P < .10$). From Tables 1 and 7 it can be seen that these interactions were largely due to the relatively low mean score obtained by Upper Michigan women who graduated in the upper half of their high school class.

Although there was little or no evidence that those students who said they were more strongly influenced by intellectual considerations obtained higher grades either in high school or college, students, in general, said that intellectual concerns were relatively more important than other influencing factors. As can be seen from Table 1, Intellectual Emphasis mean scores were either the highest or second highest of any scale for all student groups.

Practicality

As would be expected, freshmen from Upper Michigan said that they were much more strongly influenced by practical considerations of cost and location of the University than did those from Lower Michigan. Although the analysis of variance of the Practicality Scale, Table 4, also showed that students who graduated in the upper half of their high school class had significantly higher scores than those from the lower half ($P < .01$), a significant sex by HSR interaction was present. Similar interaction was shown on each item of the scale, although it was not in all instances statistically significant (Tables 12 through 14).

As may be seen from Table 1, men who graduated in the upper half and lower half of their high school class had very similar scores on the Practicality scale. In the case of women, however, there was a positive relationship between Practicality score and HSR; that is, women who graduated in the upper half of their high school class had significantly higher scores than those who graduated in the lower half (t for Upper Michigan women 3.171 and for Lower Michigan women 2.429 with 432 d f). The differences between the item means, Table 7, of women who graduated in the upper and lower half of their class were all in the same direction as the total scale score with differences on the item, "Low Cost," being particularly marked for both Upper and Lower Michigan women ($t = 2.57$ and 2.31 with 432 d f). HSR differences on the item, "Close to Home," were also substantial for Upper Michigan women ($t = 3.17$ with 432 d f) but not for those from Lower Michigan.

The relationship of Practicality scores to achievement was also evident in the correlation analysis. As shown in Table 2, scores were positively related to college achievement,with this relationship being somewhat higher for women than for men and somewhat more pronounced for Lower Michigan than Upper Michigan students. This relationship continued to be significant for Lower but not for Upper Michigan students, when the effect of ability as measured by SCAT was controlled through partial correlation. The partial correlations for Lower Michigan men and women were .180 ($t = 2.434$ with 177 d f, $P < .05$) and .221 ($t = 3.01$ with 177 d f, $P < .01$)

respectively. Thus, it seems that those students from Lower Michigan most concerned about practical matters, such as cost, may have had higher motivation to achieve in college.

Why were the students who graduated in the upper half of their high school class seemingly more concerned about practical considerations than those who did less well in high school? A possible explanation is that the lower achievers tended to come from families with higher incomes and thus with less concern about financing a college education. To test this hypothesis, information on the occupation of students' fathers was obtained from their application for admission and classified into four categories based on Roe's Criteria (1956). The categories used were: 1. professional and managerial, 2. semi-professional and small business, 3. skilled, and 4. semiskilled and unskilled. Chi square was then used to ascertain whether any relationship existed between father's occupation and whether a student had graduated in the upper or lower half of his high school class. The chi square value for Lower Michigan women was 11.166 (d f = 3, $P < .02$) and for Upper Michigan women 7.822 (d f = 3, $P < .05$). For men the chi square values were 3.048 (d f = 3, $P > .05$) and 3.450 (d f = 3, $P > .05$). The low but significant relationship between father's occupation and HSR for women was in the hypothesized direction; that is, socioeconomic status as measured by occupation was negatively related to high school rank. Thus, it seems that the higher practicality scores of women who graduated in the upper half of their high school class may be accounted for by the economic status of their families.

It should be noted that this negative relationship for women between family socioeconomic status and HSR is in contrast to the more usual finding of a positive relationship between socioeconomic status and achievement. Lavin (1965) in a review of research on the prediction of academic performance has suggested that a negative relationship is likely to be found between socioeconomic status and performance when the sample is restricted to upper socioeconomic levels. Although this is not a wholly satisfactory explanation of the relationship found in the study reported here, since the occupations of the women students' fathers were distributed throughout all occupational levels, a plausible explanation is that the sample was restricted because of social class differences in the opportunity for, and value placed upon, higher education.

In upper socioeconomic group families there is generally both greater expectation and greater economic opportunity for young people to go to college than in lower socioeconomic groups. As a result, young adults from upper groups are more likely to go to college even though they may have achieved relatively poorly in high school, than are young people from the lower socioeconomic groups. In an extensive study of 10,000 high school graduates from 16 communities from throughout the Midwest, California and Pennsylvania, Trent and Medsker (1967) found that socioeconomic status had more influence on college attendance than academic ability. This influence does not, however, seem to be as great for men as for women; for example, Werts (1966) in a study of students who entered 248 colleges in 1961 found that men from low social classes were more likely to enter college than women. In the study reported here this differential

effect of social class upon college entrance of the sexes may account for the difference found between men and women, and the negative relationship between socioeconomic class and high school achievement for women may result from the influence of socioeconomic status upon college entrance.

Advice of Others

Choice of a college is frequently, if not always, influenced both directly and indirectly by parents, peers, teachers, and others. The Advice of Others scale is intended to measure the extent of this influence.

It can be seen from Tables 1 and 5 that scores of men and women were very similar on the Advice of Others scale, as were also the scores of students who had graduated in the upper and lower half of their high school class. The absence of any relationship to academic performance was also corroborated by the correlation analysis shown in Table 2.

Students whose homes were in Upper Michigan were found to have significantly higher mean scale scores than those who had come to Northern from Lower Michigan. On one item, however, (see Tables 7 and 19) this difference was in the reverse direction; that is, Lower Michigan students had significantly higher scores than those from Upper Michigan. This item was concerned with the influence of high school or college counselors and probably reflects the higher incidence of counseling services in Lower Michigan schools. Also, one item on the Advice of Others scale (talk with admissions counselor from Northern) showed a significant sex by location interaction (Table 20). Men from Upper Michigan obtained higher scores on this item than those from Lower Michigan, whereas women from Upper Michigan had lower scores than those from Lower Michigan. Whether or not this reflects some differential opportunity for influence or other factors is not known.

In general, students thought that the advice of others had had relatively little influence on their decision to attend Northern. As may be noted from Table 1, all student groups had the lowest or next to lowest mean score on this scale.

Social Emphasis

No differences were found among the scores of the freshmen groups on the Social Emphasis Scale, although there were differences on several of the individual items. Item differences, as may be seen from the mean scores in Table 7 and analysis of variance, Tables 21 through 25 in the Appendix, were primarily differences between sexes and tended to cancel one another out. The item, "Good Athletic Program" was, as might be expected, rated significantly higher by men than by women. Conversely, the item, "Coeducational", was considered more influential by women than by men. There was also some tendency for Lower Michigan students to rate the athletic program of more significance than Upper Michigan students. On one item, "Desirable Social Climate and Activities' Program", there

was a significant ($P < .05$) sex by location interaction -- women from Lower Michigan considered this variable more important than did those from Upper Michigan; whereas, men from Lower Michigan considered it of slightly less significance than did men from Upper Michigan. Since many of the students from Lower Michigan came from in and around major population centers, perhaps the men tended to perceive Northern Michigan University because of its relatively isolated location as not providing a very desirable social climate; whereas, women may have placed more emphasis on opportunities for social life on campus where the ratio of boys to girls approaches 2:1.

Although the mean scores obtained by students from Upper and Lower Michigan did not differ significantly, Lower Michigan students tended to give greater weight to social concerns in relationship to other factors than did students from Upper Michigan. As can be seen from Table 1, mean scores obtained by Lower Michigan students on the Social Emphasis scale were either the highest or second highest when compared with the other scales; whereas, the means for Upper Michigan students ranked this scale either third or fourth in importance.

Scores on the Social Emphasis scale were not significantly related to achievement. It is of interest to note, however, that although not significant, the coefficients for all groups were negative (Table 2).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Douvan, Elizabeth and Kaye, Carol, "Motivational factors in college entrance." In N. Sanford (Ed.), The American College. New York: Wiley, 1962. pp 199 - 224.

Holland, John L., "Student explanations of college choice and their relation to college popularity, college productivity, and sex differences." College and University 33: 313-320, 1958.

Lavin, David E., The Prediction of Academic Performance. New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1965.

Trent, James W. and Medsker, Leland L. Beyond High School. Berkeley: Center for Research and Development in Higher Education, 1967.

Richards, James M., Jr. and Holland, John L. A Factor Analysis of Student "Explanations" of their Choice of a College. ACT Research Reports, No. 8, American College Testing Program, 1965

Roe, Anne. The Psychology of Occupations. New York: Wiley, 1956.

Werts, Charles E. Sex Differences in College Attendance. NMSC Research Reports, Vol. 2, No. 6, National Merit Scholarship Corporation, 1966.

APPENDIX

COLLEGE INFLUENCE QUESTIONNAIRE ITEMS

Intellectual Emphasis

1. Good faculty.
2. High scholastic standards.
3. Has special curriculum I wanted.
4. Desirable intellectual atmosphere.

Practicality

5. Desirable location.
6. Low cost.
7. Close to home.

Advice of Others

8. Advice of parents
9. Advice of brother or sister.
10. Advice of alumni contacts.
11. Advice of high school teacher (s).
12. Advice of high school or college counselor.
13. Talk with admissions counselor from Northern.

Social Emphasis

14. Desirable social climate and activities program.
15. Good athletic program.
16. My friends are going to Northern.
17. Has fraternities and sororities.
18. Coeducational.

(Note: items were arranged in random order on the questionnaire)

Table 7. Item Mean Scores (N = 55 for all means)

Item	Men				Women			
	L. Mich.		U. Mich.		L. Mich.		U. Mich.	
	HSRU	HSRL	HSRU	HSRL	HSRU	HSRL	HSRU	HSRL
Intellectual Emphasis								
1	1.62	1.62	1.80	1.68	1.95	1.66	1.62	1.59
2	1.71	1.68	1.88	1.59	1.79	1.82	1.84	1.77
3	2.00	1.80	1.88	1.82	2.19	2.00	2.04	2.20
4	1.66	1.55	1.79	1.60	1.93	1.62	1.68	1.84
Practicality								
5	1.79	1.79	2.70	2.66	1.97	1.77	2.77	2.57
6	1.71	1.60	1.95	2.08	1.75	1.42	2.26	1.90
7	1.11	1.10	2.48	2.55	1.28	1.15	2.70	2.40
Advice of Others								
8	1.55	1.35	1.93	1.77	1.55	1.44	2.08	1.90
9	1.15	1.17	1.22	1.37	1.20	1.23	1.42	1.26
10	1.55	1.64	1.71	1.51	1.48	1.42	1.55	1.53
11	1.71	1.62	1.84	1.79	1.71	1.66	1.70	1.75
12	2.02	2.06	1.77	1.75	2.00	1.80	1.79	1.75
13	1.15	1.20	1.37	1.22	1.39	1.24	1.17	1.15
Social Emphasis								
14	1.77	1.88	2.04	1.77	2.08	2.13	1.88	1.91
15	1.70	1.73	1.46	1.48	1.44	1.40	1.26	1.46
16	1.57	1.71	1.71	1.68	1.57	1.55	1.53	1.59
17	1.19	1.20	1.19	1.15	1.28	1.33	1.20	1.22
18	1.79	1.90	2.04	1.73	2.04	2.02	2.04	1.93

HSRU = Upper half of high school class; HSRL = Lower half.

Table 8. Analysis of Variance of Scores On Item,"Good Faculty."

Source	d f	MS	F
Sex	1	.05	.12
Home Location	1	.18	.39
HS Rank	1	1.42	3.03
Sex x Location	1	2.78	5.94*
Sex x HSR	1	.27	.59
Location x HSR	1	.11	.24
Sex x Location x HSR	1	1.00	2.14
Within	432	.46	
Total	439		

* P<.01

Table 9. Analysis of Variance of Scores On Item,"High Scholastic Standards."

Source	d f	MS	F
Sex	1	.90	1.94
Home Location	1	.03	.08
HS Rank	1	.90	1.94
Sex x Location	1	.03	.08
Sex x HSR	1	.58	1.24
Location x HSR	1	.90	1.94
Sex x Location x HSR	1	.14	.31
Within	432	.46	
Total	439		

Table 10. Analysis of Variance of Scores On Item,"Has Special Curriculum I Wanted."

Source	d f	MS	F
Sex	1	5.91	9.39**
Home Location	1	.02	.03
HS Rank	1	.51	.81
Sex x Location	1	.18	.29
Sex x HSR	1	.38	.61
Location x HSR	1	1.65	2.63
Sex x Location x HSR	1	.27	.44
Within	432	.62	
Total	439		

** P<.01

Table 11. Analysis of Variance of Scores On Item,"Desirable Intellectual Atmosphere."

Source	d f	MS	F
Sex	1	1.53	3.40
Home Location	1	.14	.32
HS Rank	1	1.30	2.90
Sex x Location	1	.32	.73
Sex x HSR	1	.14	.32
Location x HSR	1	1.10	2.44
Sex x Location x HSR	1	2.04	4.53*
Within	432	.45	
Total	439		

* P<.05

Table 12. Analysis of Variance of Scores On Item,"Desirable Location."

Source	d f	MS	F
Sex	1	.14	.25
Home Location	1	78.62	134.65**
HS Rank	1	1.30	2.24
Sex x Location	1	.22	.39
Sex x HSR	1	.90	1.56
Location x HSR	1	.00	.00
Sex x Location x HSR	1	.00	.00
Within	432	.58	
Total	439		

** P<.01

Table 13. Analysis of Variance of Scores On Item,"Low Cost."

Source	d f	MS	F
Sex	1	.00	.00
Home Location	1	19.65	35.57**
HS Rank	1	3.11	5.63*
Sex x Location	1	.51	.93
Sex x HSR	1	3.45	6.26*
Location x HSR	1	.27	.50
Sex x Location x HSR	1	.51	.92
Within	432	.55	
Total	439		

** P<.01, * P<.05

Table 14. Analysis of Variance of Scores on Item,"Close to Home."

Source	d f	MS	F
Sex	1	.58	1.53
Home Location	1	207.28	546.25
HS Rank	1	.90	2.40
Sex x Location	1	.14	.38
Sex x HSR	1	1.53	4.05
Location x HSR	1	.03	.09
Sex x Location x HSR	1	.44	1.18
Within	432	.37	
Total	439		

Table 15. Analysis of Variance of Scores on Item,"Advice of Parents."

Source	d f	MS	F
Sex	1	.90	1.69
Home Location	1	21.82	40.66**
HS Rank	1	2.94	5.49*
Sex x Location	1	.22	.42
Sex x HSR	1	.03	.07
Location x HSR	1	.01	.02
Sex x Location x HSR	1	.08	.15
Within	432	.53	
Total	439		

** P<.01, * P<.05

Table 16. Analysis of Variance of Scores on Item,"Advice of Brother or Sister."

Source	d f	MS	F
Sex	1	.08	.24
Home Location	1	2.62	7.71**
HS Rank	1	.03	.11
Sex x Location	1	.03	.11
Sex x HSR	1	1.10	3.23
Location x HSR	1	0.00	0.00
Sex x Location x HSR	1	.32	.96
Within	432	.34	
Total	439		

** P $\leq$ .01

Table 17. Analysis of Variance of Scores on Item,"Advice of Alumni Contacts."

Source	d f	MS	F
Sex	1	1.30	2.44
Home Location	1	.32	.61
HS Rank	1	.22	.42
Sex x Location	1	.14	.27
Sex x HSR	1	0.00	0.00
Location x HSR	1	.44	.83
Sex x Location x HSR	1	.73	1.37
Within	432	.53	
Total	439		

Table 18. Analysis of Variance of Scores on Item,"Advice of High School Teacher(s)."

Source	d f	MS	F
Sex	1	.14	.26
Home Location	1	.90	1.66
HS Rank	1	.14	.26
Sex x Location	1	.32	.60
Sex x HSR	1	.14	.27
Location x HSR	1	.14	.27
Sex x Location x HSR	1	.03	.07
Within	432	.54	
Total	439		

Table 19. Analysis of Variance of Scores on Item,"Advice of High School or College Counselor."

Source	d f	MS	F
Sex	1	.44	.76
Home Location	1	4.80	8.22**
HS Rank	1	.32	.56
Sex x Location	1	.58	.99
Sex x HSR	1	.44	.76
Location x HSR	1	.08	.14
Sex x Location x HSR	1	.32	.56
Within	432	.58	
Total	439		

** P $\leq$ .01

Table 20. Analysis of Variance of Scores on Item,"Talk with Admissions Counselor from Northern."

Source	df	MS	F
Sex	1	0.00	0.00
Home Location	1	.03	.11
HS Rank	1	.44	1.38
Sex x Location	1	2.04	6.36*
Sex x HSR	1	.03	.11
Location x HSR	1	.03	.11
Sex x Location x HSR	1	.73	2.28
Within	432	.32	
Total	439		

* $P < .05$

Table 21. Analysis of Variance of Scores on Item,"Desirable Social Climate and Activities Program."

Source	df	MS	F
Sex	1	2.04	3.59
Home Location	1	.44	.78
HS Rank	1	. 03	. 06
Sex x Location	1	2.32	4.08*
Sex x HSR	1	.44	.78
Location x HSR	1	1.10	1.93
Sex x Location x HSR	1	.90	1.59
Within	432	.57	
Total	439		

* $P < .05$

Table 22. Analysis of Variance of Scores on Item,"Good Athletic Program."

Source	df	MS	F
Sex	1	4.40	8.93**
Home Location	1	2.62	5.34*
HS Rank	1	.32	.67
Sex x Location	1	.90	1.85
Sex x HSR	1	.08	.16
Location x HSR	1	.32	.67
Sex x Location x HSR	1	.44	.91
Within	432	.49	
Total	439		

** $P < .01$, * $P < .05$

Table 23. Analysis of Variance of Scores on Item,"My Friends are Going to Northern."

Source	df	MS	F
Sex	1	1.30	2.74
Home Location	1	.08	.17
HS Rank	1	.14	.30
Sex x Location	1	.08	.17
Sex x HSR	1	.03	.08
Location x HSR	1	.08	.17
Sex x Location x HSR	1	.44	.93
Within	432	.47	
Total	439		

Table 24. Analysis of Variance of Scores on Item,"Has Fraternities and Sororities."

Source	d f	MS	F
Sex	1	.65	2.55
Home Location	1	.38	1.49
HS Rank	1	.02	.08
Sex x Location	1	.11	.43
Sex x HSR	1	.05	.22
Location x HSR	1	.05	.22
Sex x Location x HSR	1	0.00	0.00
Within	432	.25	
Total	439		

Table 25. Analysis ot Variance of Scores on Item,"Coeducational."

Source	d f	MS	F
Sex	1	2.32	4.65*
Home Location	1	0.00	.00
HS Rank	1	.73	1.47
Sex x Location	1	.22	.46
Sex x HSR	1	.03	.07
Location x HSR	1	1.78	3.56
Sex x Location x HSR	1	.73	1.47
Within	432	.50	
Total	439		

* P<.05